



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,138	12/12/2003	William M. Quinn	IBM-005	1935
51835 7590 04/02/2009 IBM LOTUS & RATIONAL SW c/o GUERIN & RODRIGUEZ 5 MOUNT ROYAL AVENUE MOUNT ROYAL OFFICE PARK MARLBOROUGH, MA 01752				
EXAMINER				
JOO, JOSHUA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2454				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/02/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

## Application No.

10/735,138

## Applicant(s)

QUINN ET AL.

## Examiner

JOSHUA JOO

## Art Unit

2454

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Detailed Action***

1. Claims 1-28 are pending for examination.

**Claim Objections**

2. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities:
  - i) Regarding claim 5, “the proposed event” should be changed to “the proposed transaction of an event” to clearly refer to claim 1’s “a proposed transaction of an event”.Appropriate correction is required.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101**

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.
4. Claims 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
5. Regarding claim 21, Applicant is seeking to patent a computer program product comprising a computer useable medium. Applicant’s specification does not provide a clear description of the claimed “computer useable medium”, and one of ordinary skill in the art may reasonably interpret computer useable medium as transmission media. Computer useable medium such as transmission media does not meet one of the four categories of invention and is not statutory. Specifically, computer useable medium is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Computer useable medium is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Computer useable medium is not a combination of substances and therefore not a composition of matter.
6. Regarding claim 25, Applicant is seeking to patent a computer data signal. The claimed invention of a computer data signal does not meet one of the four categories of invention and is not

statutory. Specifically, a computer data signal is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. A computer data signal is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. A computer data signal is not a combination of substances and therefore not a composition of matter.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 10, 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- i) Regarding claim 10, “the customized method-related operation” has insufficient antecedent basis.
- ii) Regarding claims 21 and 25, “the third party system” has insufficient antecedent basis.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-14, 16-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalal et al. US Publication #2003/0014488 (Dalal hereinafter), in view of Parent, US Publication #2002/0184301 (Parent hereinafter).

11. As per claim 1, Dalal teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a method for integrating a system with an online meeting system, the method comprising:

providing a service provider interface (SPI) defining a plurality of procedures for communicating with a meeting services application of the online meeting system (Paragraph 0022. Conference service provider. Paragraphs 0036; 0040; 0043. Execute operations such as authorizing, creating and deleting a conference, invite participants.);

implementing one of the procedures of the SPI by a software module to perform, when executed, a meeting-related operation customized in accordance with the system (Paragraph 0036; 0040. Operations to authorize user, create, or delete a conference.); and

calling by the meeting service application the implemented SPI procedure of the software module to perform the meeting-related operation (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize user, create or delete a conference.).

12. Dalal does not specifically teach that the system is a third party system.

13. Parent teaches of performing operations customized in accordance with a third party system (Paragraphs 0078; 0085).

14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to perform operations in accordance with a third party system. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Parent's teachings would improve Dalal's teachings by enabling the inclusion of variety of programs or sets of instructions to accomplish necessary or help tasks (Paragraph 0078).

15. As per claim 11, Dalal teaches substantially the invention as claimed including an online meeting system, comprising a server system having memory for storing program code and a processor for executing the program code, the program code including:

a meeting service application for providing online meeting services for users communicating with the online meeting system over a network connection (Paragraph 0022. Conference service provider. Paragraphs 0036; 0040; 0043. Execute operations such as authorizing, creating and deleting a conference, invite participants.);

a service provider interface (SPI) defining a plurality of procedures for communicating with the meeting services application (Paragraph 0036; 0040. Operations to authorize user, create, or delete a conference.); and

a software module implementing one of the procedures of the SPI to perform a meeting-related operation customized in accordance with a system when the procedure is called by the meeting service application (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize user, create or delete a conference.).

16. Dalal does not specifically teach that the system is a third party system.

17. Parent teaches of performing operations customized in accordance with a third party system (Paragraphs 0078; 0085).

18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to perform operations in accordance with a third party system. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Parent's teachings would improve Dalal's teachings by enabling the inclusion of variety of programs or sets of instructions to accomplish necessary or help tasks (Paragraph 0078).

19. As per claim 17, Dalal teaches substantially the invention as claimed including an apparatus for integrating a system with an online meeting system, the apparatus comprising:

means for providing a service provider interface (SPI) defining a plurality of procedures for communicating with a meeting services application of the online meeting system (Paragraph 0022.

Conference service provider. Paragraphs 0036; 0040; 0043. Execute operations such as authorizing, creating and deleting a conference, invite participants.);

means for implementing one of the procedures of the SPI by a software module to perform, when executed, a meeting-related operation customized in accordance with the system (Paragraph 0036; 0040. Operations to authorize user, create, or delete a conference.); and

means for calling by the meeting service application the implemented SPI procedure of the software module to perform the meeting-related operation (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize user, create or delete a conference.).

20. Dalal does not specifically teach that the system is a third party system.

21. Parent teaches of performing operations customized in accordance with a third party system (Paragraphs 0078; 0085).

22. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to perform operations in accordance with a third party system. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Parent's teachings would improve Dalal's teachings by enabling the inclusion of variety of programs or sets of instructions to accomplish necessary or help tasks (Paragraph 0078).

23. As per claim 21, Dalal teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a computer program product for use with a computer system, the computer program product comprising a computer useable medium having embodied therein program code comprising:

program code for providing a service provider interface (SPI) defining a plurality of procedures for communicating with a meeting services application of the online meeting system (Paragraph 0022. Conference service provider. Paragraphs 0036; 0040; 0043. Execute operations such as authorizing, creating and deleting a conference, invite participants.);

program code for implementing one of the procedures of the SPI by a software module to perform, when executed, a meeting-related operation customized in accordance with the system (Paragraph 0036; 0040. Operations to authorize user, create, or delete a conference.); and

program code for calling by the meeting service application the implemented SPI procedure of the software module to perform the meeting-related operation (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize user, create or delete a conference.).

24. Dalal does not specifically teach that the system is a third party system.

25. Parent teaches of performing operations customized in accordance with a third party system (Paragraphs 0078; 0085).

26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to perform operations in accordance with a third party system. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Parent's teachings would improve Dalal's teachings by enabling the inclusion of variety of programs or sets of instructions to accomplish necessary or help tasks (Paragraph 0078).

27. As per claim 25, Dalal teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave for use with a computer system having a display and capable of generating a user interface through which a user may interact with the computer system, the computer data signal comprising:

program code for providing a service provider interface (SPI) defining a plurality of procedures for communicating with a meeting services application of the online meeting system (Paragraph 0022. Conference service provider. Paragraphs 0036; 0040; 0043. Execute operations such as authorizing, creating and deleting a conference, invite participants.);



program code for implementing one of the procedures of the SPI by a software module to perform, when executed, a meeting-related operation customized in accordance with the system (Paragraph 0036; 0040. Operations to authorize user, create, or delete a conference.); and

program code for calling by the meeting service application the implemented SPI procedure of the software module to perform the meeting-related operation.

28. Dalal does not specifically teach that the system is a third party system.

29. Parent teaches of performing operations customized in accordance with a third party system (Paragraphs 0078; 0085).

30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to perform operations in accordance with a third party system. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Parent's teachings would improve Dalal's teachings by enabling the inclusion of variety of programs or sets of instructions to accomplish necessary or help tasks (Paragraph 0078).

31. As per claim 2, Dalal teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the called SPI procedure notifies the software module of a proposed transaction of an event in the online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting-related operation before the event occurs (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize before creating or deleting a conference.).

32. As per claim 3, Dalal teaches the method of claim 2, further comprising prohibiting the occurrence of the event in response to performing the meeting related operation implemented by the called SPI procedure (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. User not authorized to create or delete a conference.).

33. As per claim 5, Dalal teaches the method of claim 2, further comprising modifying meeting-related information associated with the proposed event in response to performing the meeting-related operation implemented by the called SPI procedure (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Create or delete a conference.).

34. As per claim 6, Dalal teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the called SPI procedure notifies the software module of an event that has occurred in the online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting related operation in response to the occurrence of that event (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize user. Create or delete a conference.).

35. As per claim 8, Dalal teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of calling implemented SPI procedure is in response to receiving a user request to create, edit, or delete a meeting (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Receive request to create or delete a conference. Determine whether user is authorized to create or delete a conference.).

36. As per claim 9, Dalal teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of calling the implemented SPI procedure is in response to detecting a state change of a running meeting (Paragraph 0065; 0068. Perform operation in response to request to join or leave a conference.).

37. As per claim 10, Dalal teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising defining a first class that implements the SPI and a second class that extends the first class and implements the called SPI procedure that performs the customized method-related operation (Paragraphs 0040; 0048; 0054. SPMS performs operation in response to event received by SPCC.).

38. As per claim 12, Dalal teaches the online meeting system of claim 11, wherein the implemented SPI procedure, when called, notifies the software module of a proposed transaction of an event in the online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting-related operation before the event occurs (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize before creating or deleting a conference.).

39. As per claim 13, Dalal teaches the online meeting system of claim 12, wherein the implemented SPI procedure includes program code for throwing an exception to prohibit the occurrence of the event in response to performing the meeting-related operation (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Determine whether or not user is authorized to perform request.).

40. As per claim 14, Dalal teaches the online meeting system of claim 11, wherein the called SPI procedure notifies the software module of an event that has occurred in the online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting-related operation in response to the occurrence of that event (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Creating or Delete a conference.).

41. As per claim 16, Dalal teaches the online meeting system of claim 11, further comprising program code defining a first class that implements the plurality of procedures of the SPI and a second class that extends the first class and provides a customized implementation of one of the SPI procedures defined in the first class (Paragraphs 0040; 0048; 0054. SPMS performs operation in response to event received by SPCC.).

42. As per claim 18, Dalal teaches the apparatus of claim 17, wherein the means for calling the implemented SPI procedure includes means for notifying the software module of a proposed transaction

of an event in the online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting-related operation before the event occurs (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize before creating or deleting a conference.).

43. As per claim 19, Dalal teaches the apparatus of claim 18, wherein the means for calling the implemented SPI procedure includes means for prohibiting the occurrence of the event in response to performing the meeting-related operation (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Determine whether or not user is authorized to perform request.).

44. As per claim 20, Dalal teaches the apparatus of claim 17, further comprising means for defining a first class that implements the plurality of procedures of the SPI and a second class that extends the first class and provides a customized implementation of one of the SPI procedures defined in the first class (Paragraphs 0040; 0048; 0054. SPMS performs operation in response to event received by SPCC.).

45. As per claim 22, Dalal teaches the computer program product of claim 21, wherein the program code for calling the implemented SPI procedure includes program code for notifying the software module of a proposed transaction of an event in the online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting-related operation before the event occurs (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize before creating or deleting a conference.).

46. As per claim 23, Dalal teaches the computer program product of claim 22, wherein the program code for calling the implemented SPI procedure includes program code for prohibiting the occurrence of the event in response to performing the meeting-related operation (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Determine whether or not user is authorized to perform request.).

47. As per claim 24, Dalal teaches the computer program product of claim 21, further comprising program code for defining a first class that implements the plurality of procedures of the SPI and a second class that extends the first class and provides a customized implementation of one of the SPI procedures defined in the first class (Paragraphs 0040; 0048; 0054. SPMS performs operation in response to event received by SPCC.).

48. As per claim 26, Dalal teaches the computer data signal of claim 25, wherein the program code for calling the implemented SPI procedure includes program code for notifying the software module of a proposed transaction of an event in the online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting-related operation before the event occurs (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize before creating or deleting a conference.).

49. As per claim 27, Dalal teaches the computer data signal of claim 25, wherein the program code for calling the implemented SPI procedure includes program code for prohibiting the occurrence of the event in response to performing the meeting-related operation (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Determine whether or not user is authorized to perform request.).

50. As per claim 28, Dalal teaches the computer data signal of claim 25, further comprising program code for defining a first class that implements the plurality of procedures of the SPI and a second class that extends the first class and provides a customized implementation of one of the SPI procedures defined in the first class (Paragraphs 0040; 0048; 0054. SPMS performs operation in response to event received by SPCC.).

51. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalal and Parent, in view of Krishnaswamy et al. US Patent #6,909,708 (Krishnaswamy hereinafter).
52. As per claim 4, Dalal suggests of prohibiting the event (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Check whether or not user is authorized.). Dalal does not specifically teach the method of claim 3, further comprising redirecting by the called SPI procedure a user of the online meeting system to an error page in response to prohibiting the event.
53. Krishnaswamy teaches of redirecting a user of an online meeting system to an error page in response to prohibiting the event (col. 61, lines 36-47).
54. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to redirect a user of an online meeting system to an error page in response to prohibiting the event, which would improve user-friendliness by enabling a user to be notified of the prohibited event.
55. Claims 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalal and Parent, in view of Nakajima, US Patent #6,289,510 (Nakajima hereinafter).
56. As per claim 7, Dalal does not specifically teach the method of claim 1, further comprising installing a new software module that implements one of the SPI procedures, and dynamically integrating the new software module to the meeting services application without stopping the online meeting system.
57. Nakajima teaches of installing a new software module, and dynamically integrating the new software module to a services application without stopping the online system (col. 5, lines 6-11; col. 13, lines 14-17).

58. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the one of the SPI procedures as taught by Dalal to be implemented by installing a new software module and dynamically integrating the new software module to the services application without stopping the meeting system as taught by Nakajima. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Nakajima's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling addition of software without interrupting services (col. 2, lines 26-30)

59. As per claim 15, Dalal does not specifically teach the online meeting system of claim 11, wherein the server system includes a means of storing software modules to be integrated in the online meeting system, and wherein the meeting services application periodically accesses the storage means to install dynamically any software module newly added to the storage means without stopping the online meeting system.

60. Nakajima teaches of a system that includes a means of storing software modules to be integrated in an online system, and wherein the meeting services application accesses the storage means to install dynamically any software module newly added to the storage means without stopping the online meeting system (col. 5, lines 6-11; col. 13, lines 14-17).

61. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the one of the SPI procedures as taught by Dalal to be implemented by installing a new software module and dynamically integrating the new software module to the services application without stopping the meeting system as taught by Nakajima. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Nakajima's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling addition of software without interrupting services (col. 2, lines 26-30). Although Nakajima does not specifically teach of periodically accessing the storage means, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to request updated software from time to time in order to ensure that the system is operating with updated software.

### **Conclusion**

62. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

63. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 8AM to 5PM and every other Friday.

64. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

65. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/J. J./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2454

/Nathan J. Flynn/



Application/Control Number: 10/735,138

Page 16

Art Unit: 2454

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454